

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 09/916,288		Applicant(s) KIRKPATRICK ET AL.	
	Examiner Kristie Shingles		Art Unit 2141	

**All Participants:**

(1) Kristie Shingles, Examiner.

(2) Alton Hornsby, Atty. 47,299.

Date of Interview: 1/16/07

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Status of Application: ALLOWED**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Time: 3:15 PM.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
n/a

Claims discussed:  
n/a

Prior art documents discussed:  
n/a

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*


  

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Atty. to confirm that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 11/10/2006 was meant for this particular patent applicaiton: 09/916288 and not for the patent application number listed on the IDS form: 09/916218. Atty. confirmed the typographical error in typing 09/916218 on the IDS.